



GP 3724  
✓ 41

Atty. Docket No. OLI02 P-350

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper, together with all enclosures identified herein, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

8/5/04  
Date

Sara A. VanderVeen  
Sara A. VanderVeen

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit : 3724  
Applicant : Perry R. DeYoung  
Appln. No. : 09/586,943  
Filing Date : June 2, 2000  
Confirmation No. : 6561  
For : AUTOMATIC COVER LATCH AND PRESSURE  
RELIEF SYSTEM FOR A DOUGH DIVIDER

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Attn: Director of Group 3700  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RECEIVED  
AUG 16 2004  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Dear Sir:

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.144

Applicant hereby petitions the Commissioner to withdraw the restriction requirement made in the May 5, 2004 Office Action for the above-identified patent application. Applicant respectfully submits that the restriction requirement as set forth in the Office Action is improper and should be withdrawn.

As explained below, the Examiner has imposed a three-way restriction requirement on the claims. Those claims included 66 total claims and 6 independent claims. Specifically, the Examiner has restricted the claims as follows:

Group I - claims 2, 9, 15, 16, 25, 26, 32, 34-38, 40, 45, 47, 48, 55, 56, 58 and 60, drawn to a food press with a, specific press structure;

Group II - claims 7, 8, 10-13, 23, 24, and 27-30 specific press structure, drawn to a food press with a knife assembly; and

Group III - claims 63-66.

08/09/2004 BSAYAS11 00000019 09586943

01 FC:1460

130.00 0P

Applicant : Perry R. DeYoung  
Appln. No. : 09/586,943  
Page : 2

Claims 1, 18, 39, 50, 61 and 62, which are the only independent claims in the current application, are included in all of the groups. Applicant submits that all of these independent claims are therefore generic. See M.P.E.P. §§806.04(d) and 806.04(e).

Applicant elected Group I of the claims with traverse in a response filed January 22, 2004.

According to the Office Action mailed May 5, 2003, the claims of Group III are related to the claim of Groups I and II as combination-subcombination and the claims of Groups I and II are related as subcombinations usable together.

## 2. Legal Standards

MPEP § 806.05 states:

Where two or more related inventions are being claimed, the principal question to be determined in connection with a requirement to restrict a rejection on the ground of double patenting is whether or not the inventions as claimed are distinct. If they are distinct, restriction may be proper. If they are not distinct, restriction is never proper.

MPEP § 806.05(a) states:

A combination is an organization of which a subcombination or element is a part.

Thus, a combination claim may, for example, include elements A, B, and C, whereas the subcombination by definition could only include A and B, A and C, or B and C. The subcombination clearly could not include all the elements of the combination.

Regarding the criteria for subcombinations usable together, MPEP §806.05(d) states "[t]wo or more claimed subcombinations, disclosed as usable together in a single combination, and which can be shown to be separately usable, are usually distinct from each other." "Care should always be exercised in this situation to determine if the several subcombinations are generically claimed." See MPEP § 806.04(b).

Applicant : Perry R. DeYoung  
Appln. No. : 09/586,943  
Page : 3

Where subcombinations as disclosed and claimed are both (A) species under a claimed genus and (B) related, then the question of restriction must be determined by both the practice applicable to election of species and the practice applicable to related inventions. If restriction is improper under either practice, it should not be required (MPEP § 806.04(b)).

The practice applicable to election of species is set forth in MPEP § 806.04(f), which states:

Claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive. The general test as to when claims are restricted, respectively, to different species is the fact that one claim recites limitations which under the disclosure are found in a first species but not in a second, while the second claim recites limitations disclosed only for the second species and not the first. This is frequently expressed by saying that claims to be restricted to different species must recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species.

Thus, for two claims characterized as subcombinations that both depend from the same independent and generic claim, the claims must be distinct under the criteria applicable to subcombinations having separate utility and the claims must define mutually exclusive characteristics.

### 3. Arguments

Based upon the above legal standards, Applicant submits that the restriction requirement made by the Examiner is improper for the reasons stated below.

Regarding the restriction for the inventions as being related as combination and subcombination, the Examiner has stated that the inventions of Group III and Groups I and II are distinct if there is evidence that the combination does not rely on the subcombination for patentability and that Group I is evidence that the combination of Group III does not rely on the particulars of Group II for patentability and Group II is evidence that the combination of Group III does not rely on the particulars of Group I for patentability. Paragraph 4 of Office Action mailed August 5, 2004. However, claims 1, 18, 39, 50, 61 and 62 are included in all of the groups. Therefore, since the independent claims are in all of the groups, the

Applicant : Perry R. DeYoung  
Appln. No. : 09/586,943  
Page : 4

independent claims define the patentability. For example, Applicant submits that claim 1 of Group I is not evidence that claim 1 of Group III does not rely on the particulars of Group II for patentability. The remaining combinations and subcombination restrictions can be analyzed in the same manner. Notably, all of the independent claims in this application belong to each of the groups and since claims are assumed to be in proper form and patentable over the prior art, Applicant submits that the features of the dependent claims in the groups are not required for patentability. See M.P.E.P. §806.02. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination/subcombination restriction was improper and should be withdrawn.

Regarding the restriction for subcombinations usable together, distinct claims each claiming subcombinations usable together that contain species under a genus (or generic) claim must have the question of restriction determined by both the practice applicable to election of species and the practice applicable to related inventions. The inventions of Groups I and II include dependent claims that are all dependent on independent claim 1, and as such, the subcombinations are claimed under a common genus claim. Specifically, claim 1 is a generic claim. In other words, claim 1 reads upon all of the claims that depend from claim 1.

An independent claim cannot be considered a combination relative to a "subcombination" claim that depends from that independent claim. A subcombination by definition includes less than all of the elements of the combination. A dependent claim clearly cannot include less than all of the elements of the claim(s) on which it depends. Accordingly, for example, claim 2 (Group I) and claim 7 (Group II) are both combination claims with claim 1 being the subcombination claim of each of these claims. Therefore, claim 1 is readable on all of its dependant claims and is therefore generic to all of the claims that depend upon claim 1. Clearly, the dependent claims in the groups include all the elements of claim 1, from which claims 2-17, 35 and 36 depend. Therefore, claims 2-17, 35 and 36 are all species disclosed under a claimed genus and related. Accordingly, the requirements for election of species must also be applied. Such an analysis was not made by the Examiner. Applicant notes that the Examiner has stated in the Office Action mailed May 5, 2004, in response to the arguments made by the Applicant, that "an election of species requirements has not been made."

Applicant : Perry R. DeYoung  
Appln. No. : 09/586,943  
Page : 5

(emphasis in original). However, Applicant's point was a species analysis is required. The fact that species requirement was not made illustrates that the present restriction is improper.

Nevertheless, claimed elements of different groups as defined by the Examiner may be usable together. Therefore, such components are not mutually exclusive of one another. For an election of species requirement to be proper, the two claimed species must be mutually exclusive of one another and may not be used together in the combination. Because the Examiner has failed to apply the criteria for election of species and because the criteria would not apply in this instance, Applicant submits that the restriction requirement between the groups is improper.

Furthermore, claimed subcombinations must be disclosed as usable together in a single combination. "Two or more claim subcombinations, disclosed as useful together in a single combination, and which can be shown to be separately usable, are usually distinct from each other." M.P.E.P. § 806.05(b). Groups I and II are not subcombinations that are disclosed as usable together in a single combination. As an example, claims 2 (Group I), and 7 (Group II) are claims that do not define subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. Claims 2 and 7 are all dependent claims. "Claims in dependent form shall be construed to include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference and to the dependent claim." 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c).

If claims 2 and 7 each define a subcombination as stated by the Examiner, the subcombinations combined together in a single combination would include at least two identical hoppers, two identical latch assemblies and two identical press plates. However, no such combination is disclosed in the present application. Therefore, the claims in Groups I and II are not subcombinations that should have been subject to a restriction requirement. The remaining claims made subject to the restriction requirement can be analyzed as discussed above.

Upon reviewing the Examiner's statements as to why the claims are restricted, it is apparent that the Examiner may be considering dependent claims as though they were independent claims. Applicant submits that the restriction requirement as presented is clearly

Applicant : Perry R. DeYoung  
Appln. No. : 09/586,943  
Page : 6

erroneous and therefore submits that the restriction requirement regarding subcombinations usable together should be withdrawn. Therefore, the claims identified in Group II should be examined with the election of Group I. Accordingly, Applicant submits that all claims should be examined along with the election of Group I.

As a final comment, Applicant notes that the Examiner has already made this same subcombinations usable together restriction requirement, that Applicant petitioned for withdrawal of the previous restriction requirement on October 21, 2002, and that the petition requesting withdrawal of the subcombinations usable together restriction was granted on November 18, 2002.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, and therefore requests such action. The petition fee of \$130 is enclosed. If any additional fees are required, Applicant requests that they be charged to Deposit Account No. 16 2463.

Respectfully submitted,

PERRY R. DEYOUNG

By: Price, Heneveld, Cooper,  
DeWitt & Litton

Date

8/5/04

Marcus P. Dolce

Registration No. 46 073

695 Kenmoor, S.E.

Post Office Box 2567

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501

(616) 949-9610

MPD/sav